



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/604,823

08/20/2003

Rudiger Theis

EP0201365

1822

30008 7590 10/16/2008

GUDRUN E. HUCKETT DRAUDT
SCHUBERTSTR. 15A
WUPPERTAL, 42289
GERMANY

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, VAN H

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2194

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/16/2008

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/604,823	Applicant(s) RUDIGER THEIS	
	Examiner VAN H. NGUYEN	Art Unit 2194	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 June 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to the amendment filed 06/23/2008.

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in this application. Claims 15-17 have been added. Claims 1, 8, and 12 are independent claims.

Please note that the examiner formerly in charge of examining this application, Mark Francis, is no longer employed at the USPTO. Van H. Nguyen (Art Unit 2194) is now in charge of examining this application. Please update future correspondence accordingly.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

2. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 12-14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Regarding independent claim 12, the claim recites a “**program code**”. The program code disembodied from execution by a computer or storage on a tangible computer readable medium is nonstatutory under 35 U.S.C. 101.

For the same reasons discussed supra with respect to independent claim 12, dependent claims 13, 14, and 17 fall outside the scope of § 101.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Pratt** (U.S. Pat 7,043,537) in view of **Venkatraman et al.**(US 6139177 A)

With respect to claim 12, Pratt discloses a program code executable in a Web browser and configured to cache update information received via a program-controlled device (Col 2:15-30, “...remote client may store the downloadable unit (e.g. in cache) for continued management...”) and to program the update information that has been cached into the program-controlled device (Col 4:30-

Art Unit: 2194

47, "...The software program compiler compiles a software program into machine code...").

Pratt, however, does not specifically teach the Web browser is provided on a Web-accessing device that is separate from the program-controlled device.

Venkatraman teaches the Web browser is provided on a Web-accessing device that is separate from the program-controlled device (*see col.3, lines 20-52*).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Pratt with Venkatraman because Satoh's teaching would have provided the capability for avoiding the extra cost and space required for dedicated web server hardware for the device.

With respect to claims 1 and 8, the rejection of claim 12 above is incorporated herein in full. Additionally, Pratt discloses a program in a program-controlled device (Col 2:15-25, "...to update available features,...or version information by modifying only...") wherein the method comprises the steps of: causing the device, initiated by the external Web browser (e.g. See Fig. 2 ,element 110 Remote Client), to request update information for an update of a program of the program-controlled device from the Web server; (Col 2:15-25, "...thereby enabling the programmer to update available features...", Col 3:20-36, '...to download a software ...the most up-to-date network device management

software...to update or improve the available functions...”) downloading the requested update information from the Web server (e.g. see Fig. 2, element 185 Web server) to the Web browser,(e.g. See Fig. 2 element 130 Web engine) wherein the requested update information is being passed through the program-controlled device to the Web browser; (Col 2:56-67, “...The remote client requests a function...locates and forwards the corresponding downloadable unit...”)

caching the requested update information by a program code executed in the Web browser; (Col 2:15-30, “...remote client may store the downloadable unit(e.g. in cache) for continued management...”)

and programming the requested update information into the program-controlled device by the program code executed in the web browser (Col 4:30-47, “...The software program compiler compiles a software program into machine code...”)

With respect to claims 2, 10, and 13, the rejection of claims 1, 8 and 12 are incorporated respectively and further, Pratt discloses that the program code executable in the external Web browser is a Java applet. (Col 2:35-45, “...in a Java environment, an applet will be used to manage the network device...”)

With respect to claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Pratt discloses further comprising the steps of storing the program code executable in the external Web browser in the program-controlled device and making available the program code to the Web browser by the program-controlled device for a

Art Unit: 2194

duration of an update that is performed. (Col 2:15-30, "...remote client may store the downloadable unit(e.g. in cache) for continued management...")

With respect to claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Pratt discloses further comprising the steps of storing the program code executable in the external Web browser in a Web server and making available the program code to the external Web browser by the program-controlled device. (Col 7:40-50, "...then sends the located downloadable unit to the web server, which transmits it to the remote client...")

Regarding claim 5, Venkatraman discloses trivial file transfer protocol is employed in the step of programming (col.3, lines 11-19).

Regarding claims 6 and 11,

Venkatraman discloses checking with at least one of the program code executable in the external Web browser and the program-controlled device at least one of completeness or error-freeness of the update information before the step of programming the update information into the program-controlled device and, when an error is detected, carrying out error elimination with at least one of the program code executable in the external Web browser and the program-controlled device (col.3, lines 31-53).

Regarding claim 14,

Venkatraman discloses check the update information received via the program-controlled device for at least one of completeness and error-freeness and configured to perform error elimination, when an error has been found, before programming the update information into the program-controlled device (col.3, lines 39-53).

With respect to claim 7, Pratt discloses in the step of programming the update information into the program-controlled device, a user input the scope of the program code executable in the external Web browser is enabled. (Col 5:45-58, "...the user interface...to enable communication via the output device and the input device...").

With respect to claim 9, Pratt discloses the stored program code executable in the external Web browser is made available to the connected external Web browser for carrying out an update of the at least one program. (Col 3:20-37, "...to update or improve the available functions, a revised downloadable unit...")

With respect to claims 15-17, the program-controlled device is a measuring device that performs program-controlled measurements (col.4, lines 18-62).

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-17 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record, see PTO 892, and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Applicant should review these references carefully before responding to this office action.

Contact Information

6. Any inquiry or a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2100 Group receptionist: (571) 272-2100.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to VAN H. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571) 272-3765. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30AM-6:00PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, MENG-AI AN can be reached at (571) 272-3756.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Art Unit: 2194

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/VAN H NGUYEN/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2194